UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,966	07/30/2003	Gary E. Sullivan	ACER-45258	9544

116   7590   07/07/2009

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER
STOKELY-COLLINS, JASMINE N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2423	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _23 March 2009_.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-6,10,11,13 and 15-18_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-6,10-11,13 and 15-18_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues on page 6 that the prior art does no disclose *a context information box over a portion of the on-screen overlay when a user causes a pointer to hover over one representation.* The examiner agrees and introduces US Patent 5,754,176 to Crawford, which teaches a system for implementing a pop-up help system for a graphical user interface (abstract). The help system comprises a pop-up help window that is displayed when a pointer in moved over a graphical display element that the user wishes to know more about.

Applicant argues on page 8 that deCarmo does not disclose incompatible rating systems. The examiner disagrees; this argument has been addressed in the previous two office actions. DeCarmo teaches a native parental control system (ratings manager 210) that includes a first parental control scheme and a second parental control scheme. DeCarmo teaches the parent control system controls a DVD disc drive input stream, digital cable input stream, and any other digital input stream (col. 4 ll. 47-55 and ll. 60-63). As was known in the art at the time the application was filed, television and DVD media use(d) different ratings systems. The movie industry used MPAA ratings while television broadcasting conformed to its own, more complex rating system with different ratings than MPAA and additional subratings (V-violence, S-sexual content, L-language, etc). The parental control system in deCarmo queries the rating

system for each input stream (col. 7 ll. 45-51) and controls content access based upon

the content rating that a user deems acceptable. Because there is no direct mapping

from at least TV broadcasting stream ratings to DVD movie ratings, the deCarmo

system inherently controls two different and incompatible rating systems/parental

control schemes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-6, 8-11, 13, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over DeCarmo (US 6,760,915 B2) in view of Hancock et al (US

6,701,523), and further in view of Crawford (US 5,754,176).

        Regarding claim 1, DeCarmo teaches a system for controlling a plurality of

parental control subsystems in an audio/visual system (column 2 lines 4-6, lines

9-12), comprising:

a computer (column 3 lines 17-19) having a memory (figure 1 elements 110 and

115, column 3 lines 25-31) and a display (figure 1 element 170, column 3 lines

58-60);

one or more audio and/or audiovisual devices interfaced to said computer

(column 4 lines 18-19 and 47-53), wherein at least one of said audio and/or

audiovisual devices comprises a native parental control subsystem having

adjustable parameters (which version of a movie to send, column 8 lines 5-7);

control programming which operates the computer to receive user input (figure 2

element 204, column 4 lines 35-36), said user input allowing a user to choose

one or more general parental control parameters (column 2 lines 18-22, lines 41-

45); and control programming which operates the computer to set the adjustable

parameters of each native parental control subsystem within said system

(column 8 lines 5-10);

wherein the adjustable control parameters of the native parental control system

include a first parental control scheme and a second parental control scheme,

the first parental control scheme being incompatible with the second parental

control scheme (column 2 lines 4-7 and lines 9-12 suggest DeCarmo's invention

can be implemented with multiple devices having incompatible parental control

schemes), and wherein the control programming allows a user to choose general

control parameters of the first parental control scheme and the second parental

control scheme (column 8 lines 5-10 show an example of how ratings manager

210 can adjust the parental control parameters of a device). Further, in column 7

lines 45-55, deCarmo clearly discloses that an input stream of each input stream

device is analyzed by the ratings manager and either granted or denied access

based on each input stream's capabilities. Column 4 lines 18-19 and 47-55

disclose a plurality of input devices, ranging from cable and satellite television to

a DVD player (each having its own ratings system or other control mechanisms

(see col. 7 ll. 58-67), where a ratings system or other control mechanism is a type of parental control scheme).

DeCarmo does not teach said system is configurable by a graphical user interface (GUI);

said user input comprises user selection of on-screen items displayed via said graphical user interface;

wherein said graphical user interface comprises:

a first on-screen overlay comprising ,including a plurality of first user-selectable items, each of the first user-selectable items comprising a representation for an audiovisual content rating and including the content ratings of the first parental control scheme and the second parental control scheme, each audiovisual content rating representation including an indication that the audiovisual content rating is locked or unlocked; and

a second on-screen overlay including a plurality of second user- selectable items, each of the second user-selectable items comprising a representation for a television channel, each television channel representation including an indication that the television channel is locked or unlocked; and

wherein control programming operates the computer to display a context information box over a portion of the on-screen overlay when a user causes a pointer to hover over one representation of the first user-selectable items or the second user-selectable items of the respective on-screen overlay.

Hancock teaches a parental control system configurable by a graphical

user interface (GUI) in which a user can control parental controls through a GUI.

Hancock's user input comprises user selection of on-screen items displayed via

said graphical user interface (V-Chip Plus+, col. 3 ll. 20-30);

wherein said graphical user interface comprises:

a first on-screen overlay comprising ,including a plurality of first user-selectable

items, each of the first user-selectable items comprising a representation for an

audiovisual content rating and including the content ratings of the first parental

control scheme and the second parental control scheme (fig. 7, where both TV

and movie ratings are displayed), each audiovisual content rating representation

including an indication that the audiovisual content rating is locked or unlocked

(col. 10 ll. 1-5); and

a second on-screen overlay including a plurality of second user- selectable items,

each of the second user-selectable items comprising a representation for a

television channel (fig. 13), each television channel representation including an

indication that the television channel is locked or unlocked (col. 13 ll. 37-44). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the GUI taught by Hancock in the parental

ratings system taught by DeCarmo for the benefit of providing an easy-to-use

interface for managing parental control blocks.

DeCarmo in view of Hancock does not teach control programming

operates the computer to display a context information box over a portion of the

on-screen overlay when a user causes a pointer to hover over one representation of the first user-selectable items or the second user-selectable items of the respective on-screen overlay.

Crawford teaches a system for implementing a pop-up help system for a graphical user interface (abstract). The help system comprises a pop-up help window that is displayed when a pointer in moved over a graphical display element that the user wishes to know more about. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the pop-up help window feature disclosed by Crawford in the GUI taught by DeCarmo in view of Hancock for the benefit of allowing a user to easily access additional information about GUI elements without obstructing the screen with an abundance o information.

Regarding claim 2, when read in light of claim 1, DeCarmo further teaches said one or more audio and/or audiovisual devices comprises a plurality of audio and/or audiovisual devices interfaced to said computer (column 4 lines 18-19 and 47-53), and wherein at least two of said audio and/or audiovisual devices comprise a native parental control subsystem having adjustable parameters (column 2 lines 4-6 and 9-12, column 8 lines 5-10 disclose a native parental control system in a DVD player, and column 4 lines 47-53 disclose two DVD players may be attached to the system).

Regarding claim 3, when read in light of claim 2, DeCarmo further teaches

said at least two audiovisual devices are multimedia devices (column 4 lines 47-

53).

Regarding claim 4, when read in light of claim 3, DeCarmo further teaches

said multimedia devices are one or more DVD devices (column 4 lines 18-19 and

lines 47-53), video tape devices, television devices (column 4 lines 53-54), or any

combination thereof.

Regarding claim 5, when read in light of claim 4, DeCarmo further teaches

said television devices are selected from the group consisting of televisions,

cable television set top boxes (figure 2 element 218, column 4 lines 54-55),

digital satellite service set top converters (figure 2 element 216, column 4 lines

53-54), television tuner cards, and any combination thereof.

Regarding claim 6, when read in light of claim 2, regarding limitation "said

user input comprises user responses to a series of on-screen questions", it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to

alter the parental control set-up taught by presenting the viewer with the

questions implied by the menu screen. For example, in figure 1 DeCarmo is

implicitly asking "Which category would you like?" to the user. In figure 6, after a

user has selected "By Ratings" in figure 5, the implicit question is "Which ratings

would you like to allow?". Examiner takes official notice that it was well known, and obvious, to simplify the selection process even further by displaying those questions which are implied by each menu screen.

Regarding claim 7, when read in light of claim 2, Hancock further teaches user input comprises user selection of on- screen items displayed via said graphical user interface (col. 5 ll. 36-40).

Regarding claim 8, when read in light of claim 7, Hancock further teaches said graphical user interface comprises a first on-screen overlay, said first on-screen overlay comprising audiovisual content-based user-selectable items (figure 3, when user selects "By Ratings"), and a second on-screen overlay, said second on-screen overlay comprising television channel-based user-selectable items (figure 3, when user selects "By Channel").

Regarding claim 9, when read in light of claim 8, DeCarmo in view of Hancock further teaches audiovisual content-based user selectable-items comprise television programming ratings, movie ratings, or both (Hancock figure 7).

Regarding claim 10 when read in light of claim 8, DeCarmo in view of Hancock further teaches control programming which operates the computer to provide on-screen visual indicia of user input (Hancock page col. 9 ll. 59-67).

Regarding claim 11 when read in light of claim 1, DeCarmo further teaches at least two audio and/or audiovisual devices are interfaced to said computer (column 4 lines 18-19 and lines 47-55), the at least two audio and/or audiovisual devices including native parental control subsystems (column 2 lines 4-6 and 9-12, column 8 lines 5-10 disclose a native parental control system in a DVD player, and column 4 lines 47-53 disclose two DVD players may be attached to the system).

Regarding claim 13, when read in light of claim 1, DeCarmo further teaches control programming (column 12 lines 54-59) which operates the computer to set the adjustable parameters of each native parental control subsystems is based on the received user input choosing the one or more general parental parameters (column 2 lines 18-22, column 8 lines 5-10).

Regarding claim 15, when read in light of claim 1, Crawford further teaches the context information box includes additional context information relating to the representation of the user-selectable item over which the pointer is caused to hover (abstract).

Regarding claim 16, when read in light of claim 1, Crawford further

teaches the context information box is displayed for a predetermined period of

time when the pointer is caused to hover over a representation (see fig. 4c "Time

before window disappears" and fig. 5 step 522).

Regarding claim 17, when read in light of claim 1, Crawford further

teaches the context information box is displayed in a pop-up text box in an

overlying relationship with the on-screen overlay (see fig. 1).

Regarding claim 18, when read in light of claim 1, DeCarmo in view of

Hancock and Crawford further teaches the at least two audiovisual devices are

multimedia devices (deCarmo fig. 2, see DVD input, HDTV, DSS, etc.);

further comprising control programming which operates the computer

to provide on-screen visual indicia of user input (Hancock page col. 9 ll. 59-67);

wherein at least two audio and/or audiovisual devices are interfaced to said

computer (deCarmo fig. 2, col. 2 ll. 17-19), the at least two audio and/or

audiovisual devices including native parental control subsystems (col. 7 ll. 45-

51);

further comprising control programming which operates the computer to set the

adjustable parameters of each native parental control subsystems is based on

the received user input choosing the one or more general parental parameters

(deCarmo abstract "The content rating may be based on the type of content

acceptable by the user.");

wherein the context information box includes additional context information

relating to the representation of the user-selectable item over which the pointer is

caused to hover (Crawford abstract);

wherein the context information box is displayed for a predetermined period of

time when the pointer is caused to hover over a representation (Crawford see fig.

4c "Time before window disappears" and fig. 5 step 522); and

wherein the context information box is displayed in a pop-up text box in an

overlying relationship with the on-screen overlay (Crawford see fig. 1).

Regarding limitation "said user input comprises user responses to a series

of on-screen questions", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the

time the invention was made to alter the parental control set-up taught by by

presenting the viewer with the questions implied by the menu screen. For

example, in figure 1 DeCarmo is implicitly asking "Which category would you

like?" to the user. In figure 6, after a user has selected "By Ratings" in figure 5,

the implicit question is "Which ratings would you like to allow?". Examiner takes

official notice that it was well known, and obvious, to simplify the selection

process even further by displaying those questions which are implied by each

menu screen.

Conclusion

2.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JASMINE STOKELY-COLLINS whose telephone

number is (571) 270-3459. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:30-5:00

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Koenig can be reached on (571) 272-7296. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jasmine Stokely-Collins/
Examiner, Art Unit 2423

/Andrew Y Koenig/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423